

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 and 56-79 were considered by the Examiner. Claims 1-54 and 56-79 stand rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1-54 and 56-79 are pending, and are believed to be allowable over the references cited by the Examiner as discussed below.

Furthermore, Applicant reminds the Examiner again that Examiner has not provided a basis for his rejection of claim 47.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC Sec. 103

Claims 1-32, 51-54, and 56-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski (USPN 4,654,655).

Independent claims 33, 70, and 75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski in further view of Endick et. al. (USPN 5,339,360)

Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A telecommunication system comprising:
 - a telephone headset;
 - a headset adapter configured to be coupled to the telephone headset and having an accessory interface bus for transmitting and receiving communications packets, the headset adapter being configured to be coupled to a base telephone; and
 - an accessory for the telephone headset configured to be coupled to the accessory interface bus of the headset adapter, wherein the *accessory is independently and directly controlled and monitored by the headset adapter* when the headset accessory is in communication with the

headset adapter via the transmission of communications packets between the accessory and the headset adapter over the accessory interface bus, *the accessory monitored by transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter over the accessory interface bus to the accessory.*

Claim 1 teaches a telecommunication system including a telephone headset, a headset adapter having an accessory interface bus for transmitting and receiving communications packets, and an accessory for the telephone headset configured to be coupled to the accessory interface bus of the headset adapter. The accessory is independently and directly controlled and monitored by the headset adapter when the headset accessory is in communication with the headset adapter via the transmission of communications packets between the accessory and the headset adapter over the accessory interface bus. In particular, claim 1 teaches that the *accessory is monitored by transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter over the accessory interface bus to the accessory.*

Neither Kowalski nor Applicants admitted art, either alone or in combination, teach a headset adapter that independently and directly monitors an accessory by transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter over an accessory interface bus to the accessory.

In the current Office Action, Examiner cites Kowalski at Figs. 6A-B, col. 7, lines 38-63 as support that Kowalski teaches this feature. However, Kowalski at Col. 7, lines 38-63 merely discusses that it is determined whether an entire message has been sent or received at the control unit. See Kowalski at Col. 7, lines 49-52 and lines 58-63. Kowalski does not teach or suggest that the messages sent and received on the bus interface circuitry are status monitoring messages that monitor the accessory. Examiner has not pointed out with particularity what element of Kowalski Examiner is reading on the status monitoring message taught by claim 1.

Furthermore, Examiner has not pointed out with particularity where Kowalski teaches a headset adapter that transmits a status monitoring message from the headset adapter over an accessory interface bus to the accessory to *independently and directly monitor the accessory*.

Rather, Kowalski merely teaches that the bus controller awaits the arrival of a packet from the handset, which Examiner views as “monitoring” of the handset. However, such “monitoring” of the handset does not involve independently and directly monitoring the handset by transmitting a status monitoring message over an accessory bus to the handset.

In the previous Office Action, Examiner cited Kowalski at Col. 4, lines 27-31 as support that the Kowalski bus controller monitors the status of the handset. 5-23-08 Office Action at page 4, lines 12-14. However, as Applicant explained, Kowalski at Col.4, lines 27-31 teaches a data packet communicated from the bus controller to the handsets which indicate that the bus controller is ready to send data to or answer a request for service from the handsets and peripheral devices. Thus, Kowalski teaches monitoring the status of the bus controller, not the handset and peripheral devices.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Kowalski in view of Applicant’s admitted art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Independent Claims 15, 26, 33, 51, 56, 63, 66, 70, and 75

Because the limitations of independent claims 15, 26, 33, 51, 56, 63, 66, 70, and 75 are similar to those of claim 1, the same or similar arguments apply to claim 1 and are not repeated for purposes of conciseness and clarity only.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15, 26, 33, 51, 56, 63, 66, 70, and 75 are patentable over Kowalski in view of Applicant's admitted art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15, 26, 33, 51, 56, 63, 66, 70, and 75.

Claims 40, 43, 45, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski and further in view of Markowitz (USPN, 6, 484,212).

Claim 40 reads as follows:

40. (Previously Presented) A computer readable medium containing executable program instructions for controlling and monitoring an accessory to a telecommunications headset using a headset adapter base and an interface bus, the executable program instructions including instructions for:
- detecting whether an accessory is coupled to the interface bus;
 - receiving a communication packet at the headset adapter base over the interface bus from the accessory and identifying from a rate bit in the communication packet a communication packet transmission rate; and*
 - transmitting a command or status request signal from the headset adapter base over the interface bus and to the accessory detected as being coupled to the interface bus to enable the headset adapter base to independently and directly control and monitor the operation of the accessory, the headset adapter base being configured to be connected to a base telephone, the *accessory monitored by transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter base over the interface bus to the accessory.*

Claim 40 teaches a computer readable medium containing executable program instructions for controlling and monitoring an accessory to a telecommunications headset using a

headset adapter base and an interface bus. The instructions include detecting whether an accessory is coupled to the interface bus, and receiving a communication packet from the accessory and identifying from a rate bit in the communication packet a communication packet transmission rate. The instructions further include monitoring the operation of the accessory by transmitting a status monitoring message from the headset adapter base over the interface bus to the accessory.

Because certain limitations of claim 40 are similar to those of claim 1, the same or similar arguments apply to claim if 1 and are not repeated for purposes of conciseness and clarity only.

Furthermore, neither Kowalski in view of Markowitz nor Applicant's admitted prior art, either alone or in combination, teach receiving a communication packet at a headset adapter base over an interface bus from the accessory and *identifying from a rate bit in the communication packet a communication packet transmission rate*.

In the current office action, Examiner acknowledges that the admitted prior art and Kowalski do not teach receiving a communication packet at the headset adapter base over the interface bus from the accessory and identifying from a rate bit in the communication packet a communication packet transmission rate.

Examiner asserts that Markowitz at Fig. 8-9 and Col. 6, lines 38-60 discloses user devices which send bandwidth information to a controller. However, Markowitz merely teaches that a user device *sends a request for media information*. Markowitz does not teach that the user device sends a communication packet having a rate bit identifying a communication packet transmission rate. Markowitz is silent with respect to a how the gateway proxy device (115) determines the bandwidth of the user device connection. Markowitz states only that the gateway proxy device searches a memory for a version of the media information encoded for the user device connection bandwidth.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 40 is patentable over Applicant's admitted art in view of Kowalski further in view of Markowitz. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 40.

Claims 2-14, 16-25, 27-32, 43, 45, 47, 49, 52-54, 57-62, 64-65, and 67-69.

Claims 2-14, 16-25, 27-32, 43, 45, 47, 49, 52-54, 57-62, 64-65, and 67-69, which depend variously from independent claims 1, 15, 26, 33, 40, 51, 56, 63, 66, and 70, are believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons as those discussed above.

Furthermore, Applicant reminds the Examiner again that Examiner has not provided a basis for his rejection of claim 47. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 47 is in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-14, 16-25, 27-32, 43, 45, 47, 49, 52-54, 57-62, 64-65, and 67-69 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 34-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 71-74, and 76-79.

Claims 34-39, 71-74, and 76-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski in further view of Endick et. al. (USPN 5,339,360).

Claims 41 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski and Markowitz in further view of Yamaguchi (USPN 5,278,848), in further view of King (USPN 3,793,488).

Claims 42, 44, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski in further view of Yamaguchi (USPN

5,278,848), in further view of King (USPN 3,793,488), and further in view of Waechter et al (USPN 4,943,963).

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski in further view of Yamaguchi (USPN 5,278,848), in further view of King (USPN 3,793,488), and further in view of Jones et al (USPN 5,140,611).

However, the addition of any of the additional secondary references does not make up for the deficiencies of Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kowalski as discussed above. Thus, claims 34-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 71-74, and 76-79, dependent variously from independent claims 33, 40, 70, and 75 are also believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons as those discussed above. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 34-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 71-74, and 76-79 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 3, 2009

By: /Thomas C. Chuang/

Thomas C. Chuang
IP Law Office of Thomas Chuang
USPTO Reg. No. 44,616
160 Sansome St.
11th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Phone: 415.274.2598
Fax: 415.274.2598